



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/755,747	01/05/2001	Anthony J. Brookes	78104.017	3891

7590

04/18/2002

Intellectual Property Department
DEWITT ROSS & STEVENS, S.C.
Firststar Financial Centre
8000 Excelsior Drive, Suite 401
Madison, WI 53717-1914

EXAMINER

FREDMAN, JEFFREY NORMAN

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1637

DATE MAILED: 04/18/2002

9

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/755,747

Applicant(s)

BROOKES, ANTHONY J.

Examiner

Jeffrey Fredman

Art Unit

1637

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 February 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-66 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 53-66 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-52 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☒ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election without traverse of Group I, claims 1-52 in Paper No. 8 is acknowledged.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in-

(1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effect under this subsection of a national application published under section 122(b) only if the international application designating the United States was published under Article 21(2)(a) of such treaty in the English language; or

(2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that a patent shall not be deemed filed in the United States for the purposes of this subsection based on the filing of an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a).

3. Claims 1, 3, 8, 10-12, 14, 16, 21, 23-25, 27, 29, 34, 36-38, 40, 42, 47 and 49-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ririe et al (Analytical Biochemistry (1997) 245:154-160).

Ririe et al teaches a method of detecting DNA hybridization by monitoring the formation or dissociation of a complex (page 155, figure 1 and abstract) consisting of:

(a) a single strand of a DNA sequence (here denatured human genomic DNA or purified amplification product (page 154, column 2)) which can be 292 base pairs (page 155, column 1),

(b) an oligonucleotide specific for the single stranded DNA sequence (here the primers used in PCR (page 155, column 1)),

(c) a marker specific for the duplex structure of (a) plus (b) which forms a complex with the said duplex and reacts uniquely when interacting within the duplex (here SYBR green, see page 155, column 1),

which method comprises:

(1) continually measuring an output signal indicative of interaction of the marker with duplex formed from the strand (a) and probe (b) (see page 155, column 1 and figure 1, page 157, figure 3 and page 158, figure 5) and

(2) recording the conditions at which a change in reaction output signal occurs which is attributable to formation or dissociation of the complex and is thereby correlated with the strength with which the probe (b) has hybridized to the single strand (a) (see page 155, column 1 and figure 1, page 157, figure 3 and page 158, figure 5).

With regard to the limitation regarding "DNA variation", the method of Ririe inherently functions to identify variations located at the 3' terminus of the oligonucleotides, since the oligonucleotides would fail to amplify in the PCR reactions, and yield no result.

4. Claims 1-5, 8, 10-18, 21, 23-31, 34, 36-44, 47 and 49-52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Wittwer et al (U.S. Patent 6,174,670).

Wittwer et al teaches a method of detecting DNA variation by monitoring the formation or dissociation of a complex (abstract) consisting of:

(a) a single strand of a DNA sequence (here denatured genomic DNA (column 9, line 21) and/or denatured amplified PCR products, including an 81 basepair cystic fibrosis gene product (column 40, lines 58-67)) as well as many longer PCR products such as the 536 base pair b-globin sequence (column 47, line 24),

(b) an oligonucleotide specific for the single stranded DNA sequence (here either the primers used in PCR (column 41, lines 1-20) or pairs of fluorescently labeled oligonucleotide probes (column 9, lines 27-37)),

(c) a marker specific for the duplex structure of (a) plus (b) which forms a complex with the said duplex and reacts uniquely when interacting within the duplex (here either SYBR green, (see column 40, line 65) or the fluorescence resonance energy transfer pair of labels, which differentially fluoresce when in duplex or single stranded states (column 9, lines 27-37)),

which method comprises:

(1) continually measuring an output signal indicative of interaction of the marker with duplex formed from the strand (a) and probe (b) (see column 9, lines 50-55 or column 41, lines 14-17 and figure 43) and

(2) recording the conditions at which a change in reaction output signal occurs which is attributable to formation or dissociation of the complex and is thereby correlated with the strength with which the probe (b) has hybridized to the single strand (a) (see page column 9, lines 55-59 or column 41, lines 14-17 and figure 43).

Column 14 details a similar assay for differentiating the Factor V Leiden mutation. Column 46 teaches the use of two or more complexes of the kind defined,

each with a probe specific for a different allele of the mutation which multiple detection probes are distinguished by the different melting peaks (see column 46, lines 49-61).

Wittwer further teaches measurement of the annealing based upon the first or second derivatives of the fluorescent melting curves (column 12 and columns 23-26) and expressly discusses measurement of the second order rate constant (see column 12).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-6, 8, 10-19, 21, 23-32, 34, 36-45, 47 and 49-52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Drobyshev et al (Gene (1997) 188:45-52) in view of Wittwer (U.S. Patent 6,174,670).

Drobyshev teaches a method of detecting DNA variation by monitoring the formation or dissociation of a of a complex (abstract) consisting of:

(a) a single strand of a DNA sequence (here the 10 mer oligonucleotide attached to the solid support (page 46, column 2, subheading "oligonucleotide microchip"),

(b) an oligonucleotide specific for the single stranded DNA sequence specific for one allele of the variation and capable of hybridizing to the single strand (a) to form a duplex (here the RNA transcript (page 46, figure 1 and page 47, subheading "RNA samples"))

(c) a marker detection of the duplex structure of (a) plus (b) which forms a complex with the said duplex (here the fluorescent labels fluorescein and rhodamine (page 51, column 1),

which method comprises:

- (1) continually measuring an output signal indicative of the duplex formed from the strand (a) and probe (b) (see page 49, figure 2) and
- (2) recording the conditions at which a change in reaction output signal occurs which is attributable to formation or dissociation of the complex and is thereby correlated with the strength with which the probe (b) has hybridized to the single strand (a) (see page 49, figure 2).

Drobyshev further teaches formation of two or more complexes, each with a probe specific for a different allele of the variation, and observing their respective denaturing or annealing conditions to distinguish alleles of the variation (page 49, figure 2).

Drobyshev does not teach the use of a marker which is duplex specific in the analysis.

Wittwer et al teaches a method of detecting DNA variation by monitoring the formation or dissociation of a complex (abstract) consisting of:

- (a) a single strand of a DNA sequence (here denatured genomic DNA (column 9, line 21) and/or denatured amplified PCR products, including an 81 basepair cystic fibrosis gene product (column 40, lines 58-67)) as well as many longer PCR products such as the 536 base pair b-globin sequence (column 47, line 24),

(b) an oligonucleotide specific for the single stranded DNA sequence (here either the primers used in PCR (column 41, lines 1-20) or pairs of fluorescently labeled oligonucleotide probes (column 9, lines 27-37)),

(c) a marker specific for the duplex structure of (a) plus (b) which forms a complex with the said duplex and reacts uniquely when interacting within the duplex (here either SYBR green, (see column 40, line 65) or the fluorescence resonance energy transfer pair of labels, which differentially fluoresce when in duplex or single stranded states (column 9, lines 27-37)),

which method comprises:

(1) continually measuring an output signal indicative of interaction of the marker with duplex formed from the strand (a) and probe (b) (see column 9, lines 50-55 or column 41, lines 14-17 and figure 43) and

(2) recording the conditions at which a change in reaction output signal occurs which is attributable to formation or dissociation of the complex and is thereby correlated with the strength with which the probe (b) has hybridized to the single strand (a) (see page column 9, lines 55-59 or column 41, lines 14-17 and figure 43).

Column 14 details a similar assay for differentiating the Factor V Leiden mutation. Column 46 teaches the use of two or more complexes of the kind defined, each with a probe specific for a different allele of the mutation which multiple detection probes are distinguished by the different melting peaks (see column 46, lines 49-61).

Wittwer further teaches measurement of the annealing based upon the first or second derivatives of the fluorescent melting curves (column 12 and columns 23-26) and expressly discusses measurement of the second order rate constant (see column 12).

It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the markers of Wittwer in the mutation detection method of Drobyshev since Wittwer states "SYBR™ Green I is a preferred double strand specific dye for fluorescence monitoring of PCR, primarily because of superior sensitivity, arising from greater discrimination between double stranded and single stranded nucleic acid. SYBR™ Green I can be used in any amplification and is inexpensive. In addition, product specificity can be obtained by analysis of melting curves, as will be described momentarily (column 23, lines 9-16)". Thus, an ordinary practitioner would have been motivated to use SYBR™ Green I in the melting curve analytical method of Drobyshev since Wittwer teaches that this intercalator is superior in sensitivity, is useful in the particular assay employed by Drobyshev and is inexpensive.

7. Claims 1-8, 10-21, 23-34, 36-47 and 49-52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Drobyshev et al (Gene (1997) 188:45-52) in view of Wittwer (U.S. Patent 6,174,670) and further in view of Heller et al (U.S. Patent 6,048,690).

Drobyshev in view of Wittwer teach the limitations of claims 1-6, 8, 10-19, 21, 23-32, 34, 36-45, 47 and 49-52 as discussed above. Drobyshev in view of Wittwer do not teach immobilization of the oligonucleotide using biotin-streptavidin.

Heller teaches immobilization of oligonucleotides to arrays using biotin-streptavidin for nucleic acid detection assays (column 16, lines 62-67).

It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the method of Heller in the detection method of Drobyshev in view of Wittwer since Heller states "In this example, the first probe (a capture/quencher probe sequence) has two terminal functional groups, a 5'-terminal biotin group which allows the probe to be immobilized to the surface (permeation layer) of a microlocation test site on an active DNA chip or other hybridization device." (column 16, lines 62-67). An ordinary practitioner would have been motivated to use the biotin capture method in order to permit immobilization of probes to desired microlocations of DNA chips for the analytical method. Also, an ordinary practitioner would be motivated to select a known equivalent of the method of Drobyshev for attachment of the nucleic acids to the array as Drobyshev notes a variety of attachment mechanisms (page 45, column 2).

8. Claims 1-6, 8-19, 21-32, 34-45 and 47-52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Drobyshev et al (Gene (1997) 188:45-52) in view of Wittwer (U.S. Patent 6,174,670) and further in view of Konrad et al (U.S. Patent 5,789,167).

Drobyshev in view of Wittwer teach the limitations of claims 1-6, 8, 10-19, 21, 23-32, 34, 36-45, 47 and 49-52 as discussed above. Drobyshev in view of Wittwer do not teach the use of Hepes buffer in hybridization.

Konrad teaches that " The conditions for hybridization of oligonucleotide sequences are well known. Generally, the hybridization step is either performed in a buffered aqueous salt solution at high temperature or in the presence of formamide at lower temperature. The aqueous, high temperature procedure is typically carried out

Art Unit: 1637

in a Tris buffer, such as 0.3M NaCl, 20 mM Tris -HCl, pH 6.8, at 67.degree. C.

Other buffering systems such as hepes or glycine-NaOH and potassium phosphate buffers can be used. (column 14, lines 59-67)".

It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the Hepes buffer of Konrad in the detection method of Drobyshev in view of Wittwer since Konrad expressly teaches that Hepes buffer is an equivalent buffer for use in hybridization reactions.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeffrey Fredman whose telephone number is 703-308-6568. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30-4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gary Benzion can be reached on 703-308-1119. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-305-3014 for regular communications and 703-305-3014 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0196.

Jeffrey Fredman
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1637

April 2, 2002



JEFFREY FREDMAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER